

This is a repository copy of *Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty in Aotearoa New Zealand*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/137148/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

O'Brien, Thomas Anthony orcid.org/0000-0002-5031-736X (2019) Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty in Aotearoa New Zealand. *British Journal of Sociology*. pp. 1179-1197. ISSN 1468-4446

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

## **Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty in Aotearoa New Zealand**

Individual actors have the potential to shape political outcomes through creative use of opportunities. Political entrepreneurship identifies how such actors recognise and exploit opportunities, for personal or collective gain. The existing literature focuses on individuals operating within institutional settings, with less attention paid to other types of actors. In this article, I argue for an expansion of the political entrepreneurship framework, by considering individuals in the electoral and protest arenas. An examination of the field of Māori sovereignty, or tino rangatiratanga, in Aotearoa New Zealand allows exploration of prominent actors' innovative strategies and practices. The findings highlight the actors' reliance on identity in mobilising support within the community, to press claims. Broadening the application of political entrepreneurship demonstrates the roles of social, cultural and political capital in influencing outcomes, by identifying opportunities available to individuals embedded in the community and according to the context of the arena.

**Keywords:** Political Entrepreneur, Capital, Māori, Identity, Electoral Arena, Protest Arena

The ability of individuals to shape social and political outcomes is constrained by many factors. Political entrepreneurship offers a framework to move beyond institutionalised power and consider the roles of individual actors (Hederer, 2007; Christopoulos, 2006). This framework identifies personal characteristics as well as conditions in the external environment that influence individual decisions and outcomes, by drawing on the study of entrepreneurship in business (see

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Clark and Harrison, 2018). In its simplest form, political entrepreneurship is conceived as the ability to secure resources in the interest of a select group (Bygrave and Hofer, 1991; Jones, 1978). Access to and utilisation of resources is key but broader perspectives on capital are required, to encompass social, cultural and political forms (Ireland and Webb, 2007). This application of political entrepreneurship provides a means to examine claims and actors operating outside formal institutions. In particular, it allows for consideration of individuals active in the electoral and protest arenas (Hutter, 2014) and explores their adoption of entrepreneurial positions in presenting claims on behalf of their communities.

Māori rights and associated questions of tino rangatiratanga (sovereignty or self-determination) have a visible role in public consciousness in Aotearoa New Zealand, linked to the settler origins of the state. As Sheed and MacDonald (2017: 1) have argued, 'Colonisation.... takes away the self-determination, the political agency, of indigenous peoples as they become subject to governance by the colonisers.' Key actors within the field of Māori sovereignty have used opportunities available to represent community interests (Hill, 2012b), by drawing on identity to advance claims. In this article, I apply the framework of political entrepreneurship to consider two individuals who have been active in the electoral and protest arenas in Aotearoa New Zealand (see Hutter, 2014). Tariana Turia operated in the electoral arena, entering Parliament with the Labour Party and serving as a government minister before co-founding the Māori Party. By contrast, Tame Iti has been prominent in the protest arena, pressing claims on Māori rights and sovereignty through direct action. Their adaptability enabled them to achieve positions of

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

national recognition, shaping perceptions of Māori rights in the broader community and presenting notable claims to the state. Despite their apparent common goal, their respective arenas of operation required different strategies according to opportunities available and threats faced. The trajectory of their experiences provides an opportunity to consider how political entrepreneurs from a minority community adapt to the arena of action in the presentation of claims.

The article broadens the application of political entrepreneurship by moving beyond the arena of formal institutions to consider actors operating in the electoral and protest arenas. Although these arenas are interconnected their different organising principles provide opportunities to identify how they vary and the ability of individuals to move between them. The article is divided into four sections. The first section outlines the conceptual framework, introducing the core elements identified within the political entrepreneur and introducing the forms of opportunities in the electoral and protest arenas. The second section provides background on key changes in the recent socio-political context in Aotearoa New Zealand. The third section outlines the methodological approach used and the final section discusses findings from application of the framework to the actions of Tariana Turia and Tame Iti, identifying how they sought to advance claims in the electoral and protest arenas.

### **Political Entrepreneurs, Arenas and Opportunities**

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

The field of entrepreneurship is contested, being shaped by competing views regarding its focus and underlying conditions (see Clark and Harrison, 2018; McCaffrey and Salerno, 2011; Petridou et al, 2015). Bygrave and Hofer (1991: 14 emphasis in original) have argued that, in the simplest sense, '*An entrepreneur* is someone who perceives an opportunity and creates an organization to pursue it.' Beyond this definition the concept appears limited, as motivations, expertise and the effects of the external environment shape decisions and outcomes (Bull and Willard, 1993). In a recent review of the field, Clark and Harrison (2018: 4) argue for 'a more nuanced understanding of entrepreneurship through an amalgamated and interrelated multi-perspective depiction of the field.' Mapping out the field of entrepreneurship, they reinforce the distinction between the characteristics of the individual (great person, trait, and leadership schools) and those of the entrepreneurial process itself (new venture and new entry schools) (Clark and Harrison, 2018). These perspectives on entrepreneurship draw on existing fields of enquiry but converge on the importance of opportunities.

Examining the roots of entrepreneurship, Shockley et al (2006: 206) distinguish between the approaches of Joseph Schumpeter and Israel Kirchner, arguing:

Schumpeterian entrepreneurship can... be seen as a theory of the broad, macro-level effects of entrepreneurship – namely economic change and development. Kirzner, on the other hand, posits [micro-level] 'entrepreneurial alertness' in which the entrepreneur becomes aware of an overlooked opportunity for profit

Divergence between macro and micro effects is further complicated when considering whether entrepreneurship should address process, or the results produced (Hederer, 2007; Clark and Harrison, 2018). Results can be used to judge the performance of an actor but tell us less about their actions, which are significant as 'the strategies the entrepreneur uses are understood to be breaking the mould, to be different from the ordinary, to be creative' (Petridou et al, 2015: 4). Addressing the gap between the two perspectives, Yu (2001: 49) argues that Kirznerian entrepreneurship is not passive, as 'entrepreneurial alertness is not limited to the exploitation of opportunities. It also encompasses exploration of opportunities'. Recognition of opportunities requires the entrepreneur to understand the territory and the information required (Yu, 2001). Alertness to opportunities can facilitate actions that bring change at the macro-level, combining process and outcome.

Within the field of entrepreneurship, it is possible to focus on actors concerned with shaping the structures that govern society in the interests of a particular community. Political entrepreneurship provides a base from which to consider such individuals. Identifying the political entrepreneur, Jones (1978: 499) points to:

someone who recognises that a group of individuals shares a desire for the provision of a collective good or common goal, and who believes there to be a profit to... [themselves] in understanding the costs of providing an organisation that will furnish such goals.

This perspective is reinforced by McCaffrey and Salerno (2011: 553), who note that 'ownership, decision-making, and uncertainty-bearing... [are] the primary components of entrepreneurial

activity.' Neck (2016: 205) further identifies a 'desire for a higher income, power and reputation... [obtained] not only by their own interest but also the interests of the members of their potential electorate or their interest groups.' These characterisations demonstrate the tension facing the political entrepreneur in managing individual and collective interests. At the simplest level, the political entrepreneur is an effective representative of group interests who is able to capitalise on opportunities to achieve goals. Developing the concept, Christopoulos (2006: 758) argues they possess 'distinctive behavioural traits... specific socio-political constraints influencing their ability for political intervention... [and] unique relational attributes affecting their relative power (as political capital)'. Together, these perspectives place political entrepreneurs in a particular context, by drawing influence from their community.

Central to the notion of entrepreneurialism is the ability to generate capital as a resource (Ireland and Webb, 2007), extending beyond the form of financial capital to social, cultural and political capital that may support the achievement of defined ends. To obtain capital, Malnes (1995: 89) argues entrepreneurs need 'superior skills in utilizing complex information to find out how changing circumstances can be put to their advantage'. Operating within the community, the entrepreneur is able to gauge opportunities and use them to build their capital. Christopoulos (2006: 757-758) identifies particular characteristics as:

- (1) tenacity and persistence in the face of negative odds;
- (2) an ability to create or even invent opportunities;
- (3) a competitive spirit;
- (4) an ability to invent creative problem solutions;
- (5)

strategic thinking combined with readiness for immediate action; and finally (6) the ability to thrive under uncertainty.

This suggests a particular type of individual, but understandings of political entrepreneurs' generation of recognition and adoption of leadership roles are less clear. Petridou et al (2015) note that leadership in such cases may be assigned through organisational position, or emergent, based on group perception. As the political entrepreneur flourishes in periods of uncertainty, an emergent form would seem to be more appropriate, as individuals more able to recognise opportunities succeed (see Yu, 2001).

Issues of identity and group formation are important in shaping the actions and success of a political entrepreneur. Hunt and Benford (2004: 447) argue that collective identity 'is a cultural representation, a set of shared meanings that are produced and reproduced, negotiated and renegotiated, in the interactions of individuals embedded in particular sociocultural contexts.' Assuming a shared identity, the entrepreneur is able to present a more unified claim through the 'activation of available us-them boundaries' (Tilly, 2003: 132), binding members and identifying external targets of claims. The entrepreneur must be conscious of changing internal dynamics to ensure these can be represented effectively in the pursuit of innovation and change. This in turn suggests limits, as Jones (1978) notes, larger groups come at the expense of homogeneity, making the task of the entrepreneur in balancing competing demands more difficult.



Entrepreneurial activities can upset the status quo, leading to loss of status or privileges and generating resistance (Malnes, 1995). Shared identity provides the entrepreneur with a base to launch such challenges. Martin and Thomas (2013: 24) note that 'entrepreneurial activity [may operate] at a higher tier... directed at altering the institutional context within which entrepreneurship occurs', making community support essential. Relating to entrepreneurial alertness, Meyer and Minkoff (2004: 1464) argue actors must recognise 'the effects of structural changes in opportunities as differentiated from effects or signals sent by the political system' and 'the relative weight of issue-specific versus general openings in the polity.' Where the entrepreneur misjudges the extent of the opportunity, their position may be threatened. The potential costs and benefits are echoed by Christopoulos (2006: 773), arguing that 'actors with low political capital can only hope to achieve prominence by engaging in high-risk opportunistic actions.' This reinforces the significance of capital, as the entrepreneur must judge the extent of change and affordances presented in advancing claims.

The sphere where political entrepreneurs operate can be divided into protest and electoral arenas, each determining the opportunities, threats and tools available to the entrepreneur. McAdam and Tarrow (2010) argue it is important to recognise these arenas are not completely distinct, with ideas and actors moving between them and sometimes operating in both. Hutter (2014: 27-28) identifies commonalities and distinct features between the two arenas (see Table 1), and points to a distinction based on the degree of institutionalisation and issue linkage. In contrast to political parties, social movement organisations 'do not have regular access to the

decision-making process via more established channels', relying on unconventional and informal actions (Hutter, 2014: 28). This lack of institutionalisation impacts the degree of issue linkage, meaning that 'though it is generally easier to understand what protestors want, their specific claims are most often not linked to other concerns' (Hutter, 2014: 28). The arena of operation will do much to determine the nature of opportunities and threats faced by the entrepreneur. However, as Shockley et al (2006: 210; see also Yu, 2001) note 'opportunities exist in every social arena' and '[a]ll that is required for entrepreneurial behaviour is that an actor discovers and acts on an opportunity'.

[Table 1 here]

Media are identified as an important feature of the protest and electoral arenas. Hutter (2014: 29) argues 'election campaigns and protest events might be understood as the most condensed images of the two arenas in the mass media.' Operating outside the formal institutions of the state, political entrepreneurs need to exert pressure on decision makers. In courting the media, the political entrepreneur attempts to establish their capital within the community being represented while also publicising the claims being presented (Petridou et al, 2015). Where the entrepreneur's community is an identifiable minority they may receive hostile media coverage, which can have a galvanising effect on internal solidarity (see Smith, 2013). Media attention may also impact opportunities by bringing potential allies to the fore and publicising negative, countering actions.

It can be argued that political entrepreneurs generate support for their actions by building capital within their community. Capital may be developed through the deployment of charisma or established cultural norms that give authority to individuals based on experience or seniority. Osborne (2013) argues it is difficult to find agreed upon bases for recognising authority that are able to remain stable, suggesting authority in one setting is not readily recognised in other contexts. This can provide space for the entrepreneur to operate, attempting to translate and legitimise claims from their community at a broader level. Individual actors are able to do this by seizing 'opportunity in disequilibrium and... [returning] the system toward equilibrium' (Shockley et al, 2006: 213).

I now consider the field of Māori sovereignty, to examine the utility of the political entrepreneurship framework across the protest and electoral arenas.

### **The Political Context of Māori Sovereignty**

Māori sovereignty claims animate politics in Aotearoa New Zealand, emerging in both the protest and electoral arenas. Before assessing the claims of entrepreneurs in this field, it is necessary to consider the political context. Addressing the core sovereignty claim, Hill (2012b: 35) argues it 'has remained that of Crown [state] respect for *rangatiratanga* – for the aspirations of tribes, subtribes or other groupings to forge their own collective destinies and see and do things their own way.' This claim operates on multiple levels, but remains constrained by 'monocultural

constitutionalism, that affords limited recognition to the “other” culture of Māori’ (Wilson, 1997: 24). Social pressures resulting from rapid urbanisation of the Māori community (see Hill, 2012a; Hope, 2004) and growing recognition of difference within society (Belgrave, 2014; Humpage, 2008) have emphasised and compounded these issues. The goal of Māori self-determination is further constrained by elite political pragmatism (O’Sullivan, 2005) and the fact that ‘the settler nation is deeply vexed by its own precarious nature’ (Smith, 2011: 112).

Political and economic changes during the 1970s and 1980s had significant effects in shaping the space for such claims and the opportunities available. Large-scale, state-sponsored development dominated under the National government (1975-84) in an effort to boost economic performance (Goldfinch and Malpass, 2007), followed by a period of radical neoliberal restructuring under the Labour government (1984-90) (see Kelsey, 1987). Asserting claims of dispossession during this period of change, Māori targeted land as representative of their loss. The ‘Māori Land March’ of 1975 travelled the length of the North Island to Parliament and was representative, as it linked ‘twin themes of landlessness and cultural loss’ (Hill, 2009: 168). This was followed in 1977 by the occupation of Ngati Whatua land at Bastion Point for 506 days by the Ōrākei Māori Action Committee, after it was ‘unjustly alienated’; a position ‘the Crown later conceded following Waitangi Tribunal findings’ (Hill, 2009: 171).

Institutional innovations during this period were important in opening space and shaping the way claims would be advanced. The Waitangi Tribunal was created in 1975 to address contemporary

breaches of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi signed by some Māori tribes and the British Crown, with reforms in 1985 empowering it to consider historical breaches (Moon, 2009; see also Sullivan, 2016). Smith (2011: 125) argues the Tribunal is significant but notes:

while the claims process has offered Māori communities the chance to retrieve lost tribal histories and rebuild mana (prestige)... [it] tied communities into an existing economic logic that transforms customary resources into commodities and assets.

This means the ability of the Tribunal to address broader issues of self-determination is limited. The report of the Royal Commission on the Electoral System in 1986 recommended a referendum, held in 1993, that introduced a mixed member proportional (MMP) electoral system (Vowles, 1995) and increased opportunities for minority representation in Parliament (Banducci et al, 2004). These developments created space for participation and reparation but risked reifying social structures, as 'iwi [tribes] are not the permanent, timeless entities that are often presented in popular accounts of the past' (Poata-Smith, 2013: 50; see also Haunui-Thompson, 2018; MacDonald, 2016).

The 1990s saw claims shift toward 'self-determination and autonomy rather than cultural protection and inclusion' (Smits, 2014: 48). The National government's (1990-99) insistence 'on defending the Treaty [of Waitangi] as a treaty of cession, extinguishing Māori sovereignty' (Belgrave, 2014: 202)<sup>1</sup> challenged the notion that 'indigenous nationalisms... [could] be recognised without breaking the integrity of the political state' (Humpage, 2008: 258). Pressing for self-determination, in an environment where these claims were seen by the state as

antagonistic, led to a 'revival of the protest movement and a greater presence in Parliament' (Moon, 2009: 31-2). Increased contention saw events such as extended occupation of Moutoa Gardens in Whanganui in 1996, occupations of schools in Auckland and Northland, and large protest gatherings at Parliament challenging limits on reparations (Hill, 2009).

Progress was made by the 2000s, but attitudes were slower to change, represented by opposition leader Don Brash's talk of 'the dangerous drift towards racial separatism' (Brash, 2004; see also Johansson, 2004). Such calls for unity are problematic, as 'within the settler colonial context, strategies of political reconciliation can work as a cloaking device for ongoing processes of exploitation' (Smith, 2013: 105), as represented by the foreshore and seabed dispute. Gagné (2008: 125) identifies the roots of this issue:

In June 2003, a South Island confederation of tribes, Te Taihū o Nga Waka, appealed to the Court of Appeal in an attempt to secure a court order to apply to the Māori Land Court to ask for the land below the mean high water mark of the Marlborough Sounds to be declared customary land.

Their success led the government to 'legislate to protect the foreshore and seabed for all New Zealanders' (Bargh, 2006: 15), emphasising unity at the expense of Māori claims. Protests over the legislation took place around the country, with the most significant being a hikoi (march) to Parliament and subsequent formation of the Māori Party in July 2004 (Bargh, 2006). The party gained representation following the 2005 general election, winning four of the seven Māori seats.<sup>2</sup> Belgrave (2014: 210) argues that this was important as 'the politics of race relations became much more subdued... [as the party's success] marked the end of the swing away from

constitutional change through the courts to a reliance on the powers of parliament.' The subsequent decline of Māori Party representation<sup>3</sup> illustrates barriers to the acceptance of sovereignty claims in the electoral arena.

Social, political and economic changes created space and opportunities for actors in the field to advance claims on behalf of the Māori community, but gains were contested and resisted by state and non-state actors, making progress non-linear and reversible. Poata-Smith (2013: 53) notes that 'Rather than create institutional arrangements that actually relate to the contemporary reality of a considerable proportion of Māori society, the state has actively encouraged a re-tribalisation'. This highlights the role of agency in the guise of political entrepreneurship in challenging established and emerging structures. It also supports MacDonald's (2016: 110) call to 'stop writing about individuals and organisations as "indigenous", and to start using the actual names of political actors and political institutions.'

## **Methodology**

The research in this paper focuses on two individuals in the Māori community, allowing for consideration of how capital is generated and deployed over time by actors from a minority community. This approach presents a partial view, as Sheed and MacDonald (2017:3) note:

Māori political desires are diverse. There are multiple conflicting accounts of who Māori think best represent them, what organisations Māori individuals think are best suited to represent them and what they think such representation should achieve.

Such diversity makes it valuable to consider the trajectory of individual political entrepreneurs and their ability to build and maintain support during periods of flux. Success for political entrepreneurs in this community rests on an ability to convey a vision that appeals to a broad internal constituency.

Tariana Turia and Tame Iti have both occupied visible positions within their communities over an extended period of time. After extensive involvement in the Whanganui community, Tariana Turia was elected as a member of Parliament in 1996 and served until 2014 when she retired. Tame Iti has been active in the protest arena since the early 1970s, taking part in many high-profile actions. Their experiences allow consideration of capital generation and how this is deployed to pursue collective goals in the electoral and protest arenas. In the case of Turia, it also highlights the challenge political entrepreneurs can face in transitioning from the protest arena to the electoral arena. Although there were other important individuals in this field, I have selected Turia and Iti as a particular type of actor relevant to the analysis in this space. Both gained national prominence and faced hostility from the state while remaining rooted in their communities throughout their careers.

The analysis examines the actions of Turia and Iti at key moments through their careers, within the broader struggle for Māori self-determination. I draw on source material that brings their voices to the fore, in an attempt to explore their motivations and decisions. For Tariana Turia, the core source is the auto/biography by Leahy (2015), which captures Turia's reflections on her



experiences alongside more conventional biographical detail. Tame Iti's perspective is drawn from a series of documentaries (Armstrong, 2015; Te Karere, 2015; Waka Huia, 2010) and a TED Talk (Iti, 2015) in which he reflects on his experience and outlines his worldview.

### **Political Entrepreneurship within the Māori Community<sup>4</sup>**

A sense of community is central to Māori conceptions of leadership, adopting an approach to accountability that is 'less hierarchical authoritarian and more open, honest and caring' (Ruwhiu and Elkin, 2016: 313). Henry and Wolfgramm (2015) argue that the rootedness of the leader in the community and connection to whakapapa (genealogy) are central to Māori leadership. At the same time, Katene (2010) notes that modern tribal affairs are managed through a form of dispersed leadership, where decisions and actions are taken to benefit the collective. This does not preclude the emergence of political entrepreneurs, rather it provides avenues for such actors to develop and influence the community. A challenge facing political entrepreneurs in this context is remaining true to this sense of collective responsibility, while interacting with and operating in a society geared toward individualistic and hierarchical forms of leadership.

A shared goal has been central to both Tariana Turia and Tame Iti, influencing their respective trajectories and actions. Tariana Turia was grounded in the Whanganui community, where she was involved in the establishment of a Māori language immersion school (kura kaupapa), a local newspaper, and coordinated regional work schemes for the Department of Māori Affairs (Leahy, 2015). Describing her sense of community, Turia (in Leahy, 2015: 119) argues:

There is nothing quite like the buzz of a thriving village to give you confidence that you can run things on your own, without needing the hand of the state pulling all the strings.

This close connection with the community reinforces a sense of self-reliance and solidarity (see Ruwhiu and Elkin, 2016). Iti's actions in the protest arena generated a high personal profile, but this was deployed as a tool to support broader goals. 'Its not a matter that I, Tame Iti, want to be in the limelight, had nothing to do with it, I wasn't just thinking of myself' (Armstrong, 2005). Both actors fit Jones' (1978) definition of the entrepreneur, as their focus remains on the collective good and personal interests are secondary to those of the community.

Social and cultural capital has played a role in the ability of both actors to advance their claims. Actions in the protest arena can be significant in generating such capital, by demonstrating creativity and persistence (see Christopoulos, 2006). In February 1995, Te Rūnanga Pākaitore occupied Moutoa Gardens in Whanganui, near the site of Pākaitore pā (fortified settlement) (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2014). The historical significance of the site was derived from the fact that 'it was where the Treaty [of Waitangi] and subsequent deed of sale for Whanganui had been signed' (Leahy, 2015: 169). The refusal of government officials to engage in discussions meant that the occupation lasted 79 days. Describing this episode, Turia (in Leahy, 2015: 175-6) noted:

We went there quite deliberately... taking a political opportunity to draw the country's attention to the longest litigation in the history of the country over this [Whanganui] river. Unfortunately

the media got the idea that we were occupying it because we wanted the two and a half acres, which wasn't quite right.

The occupation thrust key actors (including Tariana Turia) into Pākehā consciousness, although the media representation was not positive. Actions such as the Moutoa Gardens occupation provide an opportunity to present claims, but they are filtered through the media, making self-representation significant in generating capital (see Smith, 2011). It is important to note that the occupation had positive effects on the community, as 'Pākaitore gave new life to our old people, and an amazing sense of revitalism for our young' (Turia in Leahy, 2015: 187).

Visibility is an important tool for the political entrepreneur, as it provides a way to generate support and amplify claims. Addressing this issue, Iti (2015) argues it is necessary to:

Occupy their [the state's] space, so they can't avoid you. Draw attention to the issue that makes them uncomfortable. Make them face you and make your voice be heard... You have to keep the pressure on. Keep reminding people the things they would rather forget. We had to continually keep reminding the Crown that we are here and we're not going away.

This reflects the way entrepreneurs from minority communities generate capital, using structural constraints to exert pressure and combine strategic thinking with responsive actions (see Christopoulos, 2006). Iti has adopted a broad perspective on community, arguing 'I believe that the tino rangatiratanga flag is a flag for all people who call Aotearoa home – Māori, Pākehā and all races' (Waka Huia, 2010) and 'History has woven us together, we are the basket, the kete, that

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

holds the future' (Iti, 2015). In appealing to a wider constituency, Iti is actively contesting the notion of unity advanced by mainstream political actors.

Identity claims in Māori sovereignty encompass 'Te ao Māori [the Māori worldview]... the relationship and understanding that Māori share with the land and the experiences of the people throughout history to today' (White, 2016: 177). Addressing this issue, Turia (in Leahy, 2015: 7) argues 'our [Māori] place in this land has never been honoured [by the state] in the way that it should.' A similar sense of connection runs through Iti's actions, rooted to the Tūhoe people, represented in his statement 'When I got the call to go home, well that's me' (Armstrong, 2015). Identity is significant for the Tūhoe, as Masters and Rowan (2006) note they 'never signed the Treaty of Waitangi, never gave away their autonomy.' Both actors have sought to move beyond simple conceptions of identity, represented in Iti's quote on the kete and in attempts by the Māori Party to reach out to non-Māori constituents. Poata-Smith (2013: 26) notes the contentious character of identity, arguing:

[indigenous] identities are the outcome of interactions that involve claims made by individuals and groups to particular identities (and in some cases the rejection of those identities), and the ascriptions made by others (both from outside and within the indigenous community).

Recognition of this fluidity is represented in the acts of Turia and Iti, as their policing of us-them boundaries has been subordinated in favour of more flexible and creative solutions reflecting lived realities.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Tame Iti also represents the identity of his community with a traditional full-face tattoo (moko).

Nikora, Rua and Awekotuku (2007: 478) argue that the moko has deep cultural resonance:

By transforming their bodies moko wearers instantly transform themselves. They are no longer bare; they are layered with meaning. They contest, negotiate and re-negotiate meaning, relevance and interactions with their social ecologies.

By wearing a moko, Iti presents a visible challenge to the norms of Pākehā society and asserts his identity. Reflecting on the reception of his moko, Iti states 'I think that the moko... we have today is identity, but also politically, but I think that it has become more acceptable, bit like the [Māori] language' (Armstrong, 2005). Acceptance of moko is representative of recognition of the need to incorporate Māori values and perspectives. The extent to which this represents recognition of a collective identity (Hunt and Benford, 2004) that transcends boundaries remains contested. However, Iti has argued that there may be a move in this direction, as he recognises 'growing strength amongst our people and the decolonisation of our people' (Waka Huia, 2010).

Claims have faced resistance from established interests, requiring adaptive and innovative action. For Tariana Turia, this meant entering Parliament with the Labour Party in 1996. Discussing this decision, she argued 'I had tried everything else to get change for our people, and maybe Parliament was one last hope' (in Leahy, 2015: 207). Entering the electoral arena required flexibility, finding ways to innovate in the interests of the community while also honouring pledges made to the party (see White, 2016). Turia courted controversy in 2001 as Minister for Māori Affairs by referring to European settlement as causing a holocaust among the Māori

population that continued to impact the community (MacDonald, 2003). Reflecting on this episode, Turia argued 'I honestly believe that we should never be afraid to talk about anything we know to be true' (in Leahy, 2015: 231). This act was significant in challenging accepted norms and generating attention towards claims from the Māori community.

The fact that Turia and Iti operate in different arenas has shaped their particular trajectories and determined the opportunities available to them. Addressing her position in government, Turia (in Leahy, 2015: 451) has argued:

being in government, we know we can achieve gains and we would rather do that, we would rather feed our future with hope, than to be in opposition and watch the moment pass.

During her time with the Labour Party, Turia was able to achieve policy gains that impacted on the Māori community, such as Whānau Ora (family health), which supported and empowered communities and extended families (Leahy, 2015). Turia's increasing discomfort with the tone and direction of the Labour government's agenda (1999-2008) peaked with the foreshore and seabed legislation (Bargh, 2006), precipitating her decision to leave the party. This was a significant move, as it saw Turia re-enter the protest arena, leading a hikoi to Parliament and resigning her seat to stand for the newly formed Māori Party. Reflecting on these decisions, Turia (in Leahy, 2015: 356) noted:

After the hikoi I went home and talked to my family and asked them what they thought about forming a party... My family didn't want me to stand as an independent because they felt that would be like focusing on me rather than focusing on our people.

This episode emphasises the strength of links to the community, focusing on the collective good. It also demonstrates the intertwined nature of the protest and electoral arenas (see McAdam and Tarrow, 2010). Faced with challenges in the electoral arena, Turia sought opportunities in the protest arena, building political capital to be deployed in the electoral arena through the formation of the Māori Party.

Operating in the protest arena has presented challenges for Iti throughout his career, with high-profile actions leading to arrest. As part of Ngā Tamatoa (The Warriors) in 1972 Iti was involved in establishing a short-lived Māori tent embassy in the grounds of Parliament 'because we were being treated as visitors in our own land' (Waka Huia, 2010). The lack of issue linkage and institutionalisation in the protest arena (Hutter, 2014) have not been a significant constraint, as close ties to the community and strength of identity have served as a binding force. Demonstrating strength of focus, Iti (Waka Huia, 2010) argues:

The birds are an example to us and their distinctive sounds. They do not change their call. They maintain that with honour and integrity. Therefore, man should follow their example.

A telling episode in Iti's career involved the raids in the Rūatoki Valley, which saw the state deploy repressive measures. In October 2007 armed police raided properties in the Valley based on the understanding that Iti was planning an armed insurrection against the state (Keenan, 2008). The raids were subsequently found to be a significant overreaction. Of the 17 people arrested and charged with terror offences, only two (including Iti) were subsequently given sentences for firearms offences (Daly, 2012). Reflecting on this event, Iti noted 'That raid by the Crown will not

be forgotten. It's something that's inspired me to move forward' (Te Karere, 2015). The raid echoed the state's reaction to the Te Tauihu o Nga Waka appeal over the foreshore and seabed, demonstrating hostility towards claims of Māori sovereignty deemed to threaten its standing.

The actions and experiences of Tariana Turia and Tame Iti highlight the challenges of political entrepreneurship. Representing a minority community, both actors significantly drew on their identity to present claims and generate legitimacy for their actions. Minority status meant that their actions were directed towards challenging the status quo, often engaging in high-risk strategies to generate capital (see Christopoulos, 2006). Turia's reference to a holocaust and Iti's moko in their different ways represented such an approach, as they reinforced ties based on identity within the community, while also presenting claims that directly challenged the norms of the majority. Such a strategy is high-risk for the individual as they may be ostracised, but it is significant in activating 'us-them' boundaries (Tilly, 2003) and forcing a response. It also represents the bridging of micro- and macro-level effects (see Yu, 2001), as alertness to opportunities is used to force a reconsideration of accepted beliefs and practices.

The focus on opportunities in the study of political entrepreneurship is central (see Christopoulos, 2006). However, these opportunities and the ability of the entrepreneurial actor to recognise and act on them are shaped by the context. Drawing on Hutter (2014), I argue that an important element of Turia and Iti's activities was the arena each operated in. The electoral arena provides a space in which more stable claims can be developed, as represented by Turia's entry into



Parliament and subsequent formation of the Māori Party. It also places constraints on the range of possible actions, as individual claims (even when community-based) may be restricted in favour of party unity or discipline. Proximity to power imposes tighter controls on messages possible, as well as the range of acceptable partners. The protest arena provides a greater degree of freedom, at the expense of issue linkage and continuity in the presentation of claims. There are limits, as illustrated by Iti's arrests, where the state perceives a threat to its interests, but the threshold is higher than in the electoral arena. The ability of Turia to move between the protest and electoral arenas, and Iti's attempts to do so, illustrate their interconnected character, providing actors with potential flexibility in use of opportunities for the presentation of claims.

The longer-term viability of political entrepreneurship presents a challenge for such actors, as the need for alertness and innovation may be difficult to sustain. In the case of Tariana Turia and the Māori Party, consolidation meant its appeal plateaued and, as it ceased to be novel, people considered its record in securing outcomes. Compromises necessary in the electoral arena led to the Party being seen as less of a threat to the status quo. In the protest arena, Tame Iti saw success in generating a public profile and attention for the claims he was presenting. However, the need to innovate brought pressure, as the state sought to restrict particular forms of contention and act against those deemed to be in violation of accepted norms.

## **Conclusion**

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Political entrepreneurship offers an alternative lens through which to consider the way individual actors attempt to bring about change (see McCaffrey and Salerno, 2011; Petridou et al, 2015; Yu, 2001). Drawing on more general approaches to entrepreneurship, it moves away from financial considerations to address changes in the political sphere (see Christopoulos, 2006; Jones, 1978). This paper seeks to add to this literature, by moving away from a focus on resources to address other forms of capital and types of actors. Examining individuals from a minority community that is driven by identity-based goals brings diversity of entrepreneurship into focus. It also argues for greater attention to variation in the opportunities derived from the external environment, utilising Hutter's (2014) conceptualisation of the protest and electoral arenas.

The issue of Māori sovereignty escalated on the political agenda in Aotearoa New Zealand from the 1960s, coinciding with broader social and political changes and state attempts to institutionalise rights and provide redress. Contention over the rights of Māori communities provided space for entrepreneurial actors to emerge and present claims. Operating in the electoral arena, Tariana Turia used her position in an established political party to capitalise on opportunities to challenge existing practices. Actions by the state to restrict the boundaries of claims from the Māori community, as embodied in the foreshore and seabed legislation, created further opportunities for innovation, embodied in Turia's move between the electoral and protest arenas in forming the Māori Party. Increasing assertiveness was also apparent in the protest arena, as actors such as Tame Iti drew on shared identity and recognition of past injustices to frame and present claims, meaning lack of issue linkage and institutionalisation were less of a

constraint. Together, their experiences demonstrate the importance of contextualised opportunities in enabling the entrepreneur to construct and successfully present claims.

Lessons can be drawn from the analysis of these two actors in Aotearoa New Zealand. Political entrepreneurs use their skills and resources to present claims on behalf of a collective, with their ability to do so determined by the external environment. Adapting the concept of political entrepreneurship to include actors in the protest arena provides an opening to incorporate actions outside the formal institutional sphere. Focusing on individuals in the electoral and protest arenas has shown that, while there are similarities, the character of the opportunities available does much to shape their actions. Entrepreneurs in the electoral arena have access to resources and greater issue linkage, but are constrained by institutional structures and normative expectations. The protest arena provides greater creative freedom but at the expense of stability, requiring more effort to sustain claims. In assessing political entrepreneurs, it is therefore necessary to consider the opportunities and constraints present in the context of their chosen arena. Identity plays an important role in defining group interests and generating social, cultural and political capital to support claims presented in either arena. The strength of identity claims represented by both actors enabled them to innovate, reinforcing connection to community and assertion of collective interests. Greater attention to these unacknowledged aspects of political entrepreneurship enhances the framework's applicability.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

---

<sup>1</sup> This stance was rejected by the Waitangi Tribunal in a 2014 decision (Waitangi Tribunal, 2014). For a summary of perspectives on the status of the Treaty see O'Sullivan, 2008.

<sup>2</sup> Māori seats are allocated on basis of the number of voters on the Māori electoral roll (see Comrie et al, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> Māori Party representation fell from five seats in 2008 to three in 2011 and two in 2014. The party failed to gain representation in 2017 (Electoral Commission, n.d.).

<sup>4</sup> This section draws on Leahy's (2015) biography of Tariana Turia to capture her voice and perspective on the events described. Tame Iti's perspective is captured through a number of documentaries and news pieces in which he reflected on and discussed his beliefs and activism.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', *British Journal of Sociology*, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

## References:

Armstrong, D. (Producer). 2005 *Tame Iti – The Man Behind the Moko*, Wellington: NZ On Screen.

Banducci, S., Donovan, T. and Karp, J. 2004 'Minority Representation, Empowerment, and Participation', *The Journal of Politics* 66(2): 534-56.

Bargh, M. 2006 'Changing the Game Plan: The Foreshore and Seabed Act and Constitutional Change', *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 1(1): 13-24.

Belgrave, M. 2014 'Beyond the Treaty of Waitangi: Māori Tribal Aspirations in an Era of Reform, 1984-2014', *The Journal of Pacific History* 49(2): 193-213.

Brash, D. 2004 'Nationhood – Don Brash Speech Orewa Rotary Club', *Scoop*. Retrieved December 18, 2017, from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0401/S00220.htm>

Bull, I. and Willard, G. (1993) 'Towards a Theory of Entrepreneurship', *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(3): 183-95.

Bygrave, W. and Hofer, C. (1992) 'Theorizing About Entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2): 13-22.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Christopoulos, D. 2006 'Relational Attributes of Political Entrepreneurship: A Network Perspective', *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(5): 757-778.

Clark, C. and Harrison, C. (2018) 'Entrepreneurship: An Assimilated Multi-Perspective Review', *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, ifirst.

Comrie, M., Gillies, A. and Day, M. 2002 'The Maori Electoral Option Campaign: Problems of Measuring "Success"', *Political Science* 54(2): 45-57.

Daly, M. 2012 "'Urewera Four" Sentences Decried by Iwi Leader', *Stuff.co.nz*. Retrieved February 6, 2015, from <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/crime/6988521/Urewera-Four-sentences-decried-by-iwi-leader>

Gagné, N. 2008 'On the Ethnicisation of New Zealand Politics: The Foreshore and Seabed Controversy in Context', *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 9(2): 123-40.

Goldfinch, S. and Malpass, D. 2007 'The Polish Shipyard: Myth, Economic History and Economic Policy Reform in New Zealand', *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 53(1): 118-37.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Haunui-Thompson, S. 2018 'Anger at a Treaty Process which Pits Iwi against Iwi', *Radio New Zealand*. Retrieved May 16, 2018, from <https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/on-the-inside/357532/anger-at-a-treaty-process-which-pits-iwi-against-iwi>

Hederer, C. 2007 'Political Entrepreneurship and Institutional Change: An Evolutionary Approach', *EAEPE Conference*. Retrieved December 5, 2017, from <http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/8249/>

Henry, E. and Wolfram, R. 2015 'Relational Leadership – An Indigenous Māori Perspective', *Leadership ifirst*: 1-17. doi: 10.1177/1742715015616282

Hill, R. 2009 *Maori and the State: Crown-Maori Relations in New Zealand/Aotearoa, 1950-2000*, Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Hill, R. 2012a 'Maori Urban Migration and the Assertion of Indigeneity in Aotearoa/New Zealand, 1945-1975', *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 14(2): 256-78.

Hill, R. 2012b 'People, Land and the Struggle for Rangatiratanga/Autonomy in New Zealand', *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 19(1): 26-42.

Hope, S. 2004 'The Roots and Reach of Rangatiratanga', *Political Science* 56(1): 23-54.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Humpage, L. 2008 'Revision Required: Reconciling New Zealand Citizenship with Māori Nationalisms', *National Identities* 10(3): 247-61.

Hunt, S. and Benford, R. 2004 'Collective Identity, Solidarity, and Commitment', in D. Snow, S. Soule, and H. Kriesi (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Hutter, S. 2014 *Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe: New Cleavages in Left and Right Politics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ireland, R. and Webb, J. 2007 'A Cross-Disciplinary Exploration of Entrepreneurship Research', *Journal of Management* 33(6): 891-927.

Iti, T. 2015 *Mana: The Power in Knowing Who You Are*. Retrieved November 14, 2016, from <http://tedxtalks.ted.com/video/Mana-The-power-in-knowing-who-y>

Johansson, J. 2004 'Orewa and the Rhetoric of Illusion', *Political Science* 56(2): 111-29.

Jones, P. 1978 'The Appeal of the Political Entrepreneur', *British Journal of Political Science* 8(4): 498-504.



*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Katene, S. 2010 'Modelling Māori Leadership: What Makes Good Leadership?', *MAI Review* 2(2): 1-16.

Keenan, D. 2008 'The Terror Raids and the Criminalising of Dissent' in D. Keenan (ed.), *Terror in Our Midst? Searching for Terror in Aotearoa New Zealand*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Leahy, H. 2015 *Crossing the Floor: The Story of Tariana Turia*, Wellington: Huia Press.

MacDonald, D. 2003 'Daring to Compare: The Debate about a Maori "Holocaust" in New Zealand', *Journal of Genocide Research* 5(3): 383-403.

MacDonald, L.T.A.O.T. 2016 'Decolonisation Starts in a Name: Moving on from the Colonial Pretence that "Māori" or "Indigenous Peoples" are Explanatory Frames', *Political Science* 68(2): 105-23.

Malnes, R. 1995 "'Leader" and "Entrepreneur" in International Negotiations: A Conceptual Analysis', *European Journal of International Relations* 1(1): 87-112.

Masters, C. and Rowan, J. 2006 'Shotgun Diplomacy the Tuhoe Way', *New Zealand Herald*.

Retrieved February 6, 2015, from

[http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=10389147](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10389147)

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Martin, A. and Thomas, D. 2013 'Two-Tiered Political Entrepreneurship and the Congressional Committee System', *Public Choice* 154(1-2): 21-37.

McAdam, D. and Tarrow, S. 2010 'Ballots and Barricades: On the Reciprocal Relationship between Elections and Social Movements', *Perspectives on Politics* 8(2): 529-42.

McCaffrey, M. and Salerno, J. (2011) 'A Theory of Political Entrepreneurship', *Modern Economy* 2(4): 552-60.

Meyer, D. and Minkoff, D. 2004 'Conceptualizing Political Opportunity', *Social Forces* 82(4): 1457-1492.

Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2014 'Moutoa Gardens Protest', *New Zealand History*.

Retrieved December 15, 2016, from <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/moutoa-gardens-protest>

New Zealand Electoral Commission. Retrieved February 6, 2015, from <http://www.elections.org.nz/>

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Neck, R. 2016 'The Political Entrepreneur: Deus ex Machina of Public Choice Theory?' in D.

Bögenhold, J. Bonnet, M. Dejardin, and D. Garcia Pérez de Lema (ed.) *Contemporary*

*Entrepreneurship: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Innovation and Growth*, Berlin: Springer.

Nikora, L., Rua, M. and Awekotuku, N. 2007 'Renewal and Resistance: Moko in Contemporary New Zealand', *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology* 17(6): 477-89.

O'Sullivan, D. 2005 'Māori Self-Determination: In the Modern Political Context', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 1(1): 48-63.

O'Sullivan, D. 2008 'The Treaty of Waitangi in Contemporary New Zealand Politics', *Australian Journal of Political Science* 43(2): 317-31.

Osborne, T. 2013 'Authority, Convention and Political Community', *Journal of Political Power* 6(1): 127-31.

Petridou, E., Aflaki, I. and Miles, L. 2015 'Unpacking the Theoretical Boxes of Political Entrepreneurship', in I. Aflaki and E. Petridou (ed.) *Entrepreneurship in the Polis: Understanding Political Entrepreneurship*, London: Routledge.

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

Poata-Smith, E. 2013 'Emerging Identities: The Changing Contours of Indigenous Identities in Aotearoa/New Zealand', in M. Nataka, M. Harris and B. Carlsson (ed.) *The Politics of Identity: Emerging Indigeneity*, Sydney: University of Technology Sydney E-Press.

Ruwhiu, D. and Elkin, G. 2016 'Converging Pathways of Contemporary Leadership: In the Footsteps of Māori and Servant Leadership', *Leadership* 12(3): 308-23.

Sheed, T. and MacDonald, L.T.A.O.T. 2017 'The Diverse Stories of Māori Political Agency: A Q Method Study', *Political Science ifirst*: 1-13. doi: 10.1080/00323187.2017.1414572

Shockley, G., Stough, R., Haynes, K. and Frank, P. (2006) 'Toward a Theory of Public Entrepreneurship', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management* 6(3): 205-23.

Smith, J. 2011 'Aotearoa/New Zealand: An Unsettled State in a Sea of Islands', *Settler Colonial Studies* 1(1): 111-31.

Smith, J. 2013. 'Māori Television's Indigenous Insistence', *Studies in Australasian Cinema* 7(2-3): 101-10.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', *British Journal of Sociology*, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Smits, K. 2014 'The Neoliberal State and the Uses of Indigenous Culture', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 20(1): 43-62.

Sullivan, A. 2016 'The Politics of Reconciliation in New Zealand', *Political Science* 68(2): 124-42.

Te Karere 2015 *Tame Iti – Spiritual Inspirer*. Retrieved December 19, 2016, from

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=om7WcABRT3U>

Tilly, C. 2003 *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vowles, J. 1995 'The Politics of Electoral Reform in New Zealand', *International Political Science Review* 16(1): 95-115.

Waitangi Tribunal 2014 *The Declaration and the Treaty: The Report on Stage 1 of the Te*

*Paparahi o Te Raki Inquiry*, Wai 1040, Wellington. Retrieved June 5, 2015, from

<http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry>

Waka Huia 2010 *Maori Activist Tame Iti*. Retrieved November 14, 2016, from

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rge2BA\\_wyEQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rge2BA_wyEQ)

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Brien, T. (2018) 'Political Entrepreneurship in the Field of Māori Sovereignty', British Journal of Sociology, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12611>.*

*This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.*

White, T. 2016 'A Difference of Perspective? Māori Members of Parliament and Te Ao Māori in Parliament', *Political Science* 68(2): 175-91.

Yu, T. (2001) 'Entrepreneurial Alertness and Discovery', *Review of Austrian Economics*, 14(1): 47-63.